

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. While the claims are currently believed to distinguish over the cited art, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended to expedite prosecution. The disclosure has also been amended to provide reference numbers to copending U.S. patent applications. These changes to the disclosure are made to overcome the Examiner's objection to the disclosure. In view of following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,577) in view of Froessl (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,528). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because neither Davis nor Froessl, alone or in combination with one another teach or suggest the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 recites, among other things, a method for selecting a font to output a message represented by at least one unknown language and includes parsing characters of the message and comparing each character of the message against all entries in a character table bank during an initial search, wherein the entries in the character table bank comprise a plurality of character sets and wherein the plurality of character sets includes all available character sets. At least these features are not taught or suggested by the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Davis is deficient for several reasons. First, Davis discloses a table that includes a plurality of character codes and not character sets. Davis is also deficient for disclosing a system and method that has prior knowledge of a currently selected font and automatically selecting a new font so that a user sees the characters and fonts expected to appear in a document. As such, Davis requires knowledge of the expected characters and fonts. Apparently, if a particular font cannot display a character, all the

previous characters in the text stream and all subsequent characters in the text stream are processed to find a font that can display the missing character (See column 5, lines 20-29). If a font cannot be found by parsing the subset of fonts represented by all the previous characters in the text stream and all subsequent characters in the text stream, the system then performs a second search using all available fonts on the system. By contrast, claim 1 recites that each character is compared against all available character sets during an initial search. As a result, Davis is deficient because it fails to search against all available character sets during an initial search.

Froessl does not overcome this deficiency. Froessl appears to describe a system and method of scanning documents for mass storage and for creating a selection of search words for the stored documents (column 3, lines 4-9). If a character is not recognized by an OCR system after scanning, a font table may be consulted in an attempt to determine the value of the ambiguous character (columns 9-10; column 14). However, it appears that the ambiguous character may be associated with a particular font only if the font of the remainder of the document is known (column 10, lines 1-10). Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Davis and Froessl. Claims 6, 11, and 16 include features similar to those of claim 1 not taught or suggested by Davis and/or Froessl. For at least this reason, these independent claims are also patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-20 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 6, 11, and 16. For at least the reasons set for above, these dependent claims are also patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Conclusion

A full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: November 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102
703-905-2107

Customer Number
00909